

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2000

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

PRESENT, COMMISSIONERS: Mathewson, Wiecha, Petersen, Purcell, Parsons

ABSENT, COMMISSIONER: Peirona

PRESENT, STAFF: Interim Community Development Director Macris, Principal Planner de Melo, Public Works Director Curtis, Deputy City Attorney Rubens, Recording Secretary Wong

AGENDA STUDY SESSION: Principal Planner de Melo informed the Commission that: 1) additional information on the sprint antennas from the neighborhood contingent was received on July 3, 2000, and 2) the applicant for 2605 Somerset Drive requested continuance of the public hearing to August 1, 2000.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS: None.

COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments): None.

STATUS REPORTS

Village Center and Blockbuster walls and discussion of stone and lettering

Director Macris stated that Director Curtis was present to provide a status report on the project and to seek the Commission's direction on the materials to be used on the fascia wall, and noted that the Council had asked the Commission to revisit whether there should be signs on the walls as well.

Director Curtis stated that the Council, at their June 27 meeting, granted permission to reject the one bid received for the placement of the fascia on the walls at Blockbuster and Max's, and to rebid the job, using an alternative stone. He noted that the project had been divided into three separate elements: 1) structural walls that actually held back the dirt and supported the structure around it, 2) the fascia, and 3) the landscaping. The landscaping phase was not on the agenda for this meeting but would come to the Commission for their approval and would also need to be approved by Caltrans because it was located in their right-of-way. Caltrans had indicated that it might take from four to six weeks from the submittal of drawings for their approval. Director Curtis presented stones from two different quarries: 1) Connecticut Bluestone which the Commission had seen previously, and 2) another similar in name from a quarry in Pennsylvania. Director Curtis noted that the contractor who had bid the job stated that he could use either stone for the fascia. Chair Parsons stated for the record that he, Director Curtis, Director Macris, Principal Planner de Melo, and Commissioner Mathewson had walked the Blockbuster and Max's development, looked at the existing structural walls, and Director Curtis had indicated that there would be some extensions of walls that would be done with concrete block, in front of Max's, in front

of Blockbuster, and further down in front of some of the other stores behind Max's on El Camino. They discussed the feasibility of continuing the fascia using the same stone all the way up. Director Curtis stated that the contractor had been issued a directive to extend the wall between El Camino and the Emmett House approximately six ft. and also on Ralston by Blockbuster extending essentially up to the driveway. He added that the structural wall in front of the other stores behind Max's would not extend upward but there would be an additional wall to enable the landscaping to occur. Responding to Chair Parson's question, he stated that the wall could be faced with the stone. The Commission concurred that as long as there was a wall it should have the stone fascia to provide continuity and directed the Department of Public Works to proceed accordingly. Director Curtis mentioned that the rain gutter drains from the Blockbuster building had been moved so that the wall was not directly against the Blockbuster building wall at that point. He added that the drain pipe would be buried behind the wall out of sight. Regarding the stone, Chair Parsons asked why the contractor who had bid on the project used a different stone than the one approved by the Commission. Director Curtis stated that he was unable to get a satisfactory quote and delivery to get the stone that was asked for and he had the other stone available and asked if he could use it. Director Curtis felt that it was a reasonable request since it was sandstone, the coloration was nearly the same, and it would not look like concrete. Responding to Commissioner Purcell's question regarding a mock-up for inspection purposes, Director Curtis suggested that a few yards could be put in place for approval before proceeding with the rest of the job. Commissioner Petersen reiterated that a mockup would be good because she couldn't visualize what it would look like. With consensus of the Commissioners, Chair Parsons asked that after a bid had been accepted that the contractor provide a mockup of a short section of wall showing a typical pattern and mix of stones that the Commission, Council, and the public could preview. Commissioner Purcell stated that would be acceptable as long as the contractor understood that if it was not satisfactory, then it would have to be removed, and the stone replaced.

Director Macris stated that the landscape plan would be presented at a Commission meeting. Chair Parsons stated that the owner of the Max's property would have a two ft. planting bed on top of the wall off the Max's patio.

Chair Parsons said that the Commission decided on no signage several months ago and was concerned that the plants hanging over the wall might block the sign, vandalism, private/City property, lack of control by the City, this was not an entrance to Belmont, and was inconsistent with the City's policy to reduce signage.

Chair Parsons suggested looking at the feasibility of putting a sign on the wall after the walls and landscaping were completed. Chair Parsons also suggested a place for electrical wiring on the wall if it was needed at Christmas or other holidays.

In response to Denny Lawhern, Interim Director Macris replied that the Council had referred this item to the Commission for reconsideration and that staff would be reporting the Commission's action.

Denny Lawhern respectfully disagreed with some of the Commissioners since he thought there was a strong need for identity in the Belmont Village Center. He thought that the City and the developer deserved some identity to make this a thriving village center. Mr. Lawhern said that this was always called the Village Center and by some means that was removed. He stated that there were plenty of schematics and drawings showing the "Belmont Village Center" sign attached to the wall. Mr. Lawhern

would like to proceed with another sign on this site and across the street to bring some continuity to the City.

Doris Barbegelata, 819 Holly Rd., showed some of the signs that Frank Gonsalves came up with. She agreed with Mr. Lawhern that this had been identified as the Belmont Village Center from the beginning on all the plans, and no one objected until the Carlmont Shopping Center did. She said that she was more interested in flowers and landscaping. Mrs. Barbegelata stated that this was a window of opportunity to beautify Belmont in terms of entrance on either end. She mentioned that she had anti-graffiti information.

Director Curtis stated that the City had an agreement with both landowners to construct and maintain the walls so the City would be in control of what would be on the walls.

Chair Parsons stated that the consensus was to wait until the wall and landscaping were completed prior to considering any signage.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Continued Public Hearing - 819 Miramar Terrace; To consider design review and floor area ratio exception to construct a ground floor and second story addition of approximately 1,324 sq. ft. to an existing 2,874 sq. ft. home. The proposed new total would be 4,198 sq. ft. where the maximum permitted is 3,500 sq. ft. The site is 16,813 sq. ft. in area and contains a 6.6% slope that permits a 0.533 floor area ratio (FAR). Without the Ordinance cap, the permitted floor area would be 8,961 sq. ft. The existing FAR is 0.171 and the proposed FAR is 0.249 (Appl. No. 00-1023); APN: 045-140-210; Zoned: R-1A; CEQA Status: Exempt; CJW Architecture (Applicant); Mr. and Mrs. David Hawley (Owners)

Commissioner Wiecha recused herself since she lived within 300' of the subject property, stepped down from the dais, and sat in the audience. Deputy City Attorney Rubens recused himself since one of the partners in his law firm lived within 300' of the subject property, stepped down from the dais, and sat in the audience. Principal Planner de Melo presented the staff report recommending approval.

David Hawley, 2124 Coronet Blvd, applicant, stated that he submitted his application to the City in March, met with some of the immediate neighbors to discuss the street elevation, and received initial reviews. Due to these view concerns, ridge line poles were constructed just prior to the meeting, and was asked to try to resolve some of those concerns. At the first Commission meeting on April 18, he received a positive response from the Commission on the overall design and on the FAR exception. There were concerns about the views and the mass. A computer model of the house was generated and presented to the neighbors individually prior to the May 18 meeting. A more formal review process was recommended to ensure that all the neighborhood views were heard and appropriate changes could be made. Individual meetings were held with the affected neighbors: Fords, Hsus, Andes, Liebermans, and Andrews. Their concerns were used as the basis for the current design. The comments were reviewed with the architect. Two designs were prepared and reviewed at an onsite neighborhood meeting on May 30 which was also attended by the Principal Planner. Everybody was invited who had comments on the plan at the previous Commission meeting. An agreement was made to make a model to show the neighbors what the design would look like. A second neighborhood meeting was held onsite on June 16 which was sparsely attended. The second plan was preferred and was sent to the planner for review.

Mr. Hawley summarized the neighbors' concerns: The Fords, the adjacent neighbors at 811 Miramar Terrace, said that the current large structure at the rear of the property was offensive and requested that he not extend any addition too far along the rear wing to preserve the privacy of his backyard to which they then approved the proposal. The Hsus, adjacent neighbors at 825 Miramar Terrace, requested that the second floor not be sited beyond the current chimney because that would affect the light and privacy in the lower floor rooms to which they then approved the proposal. The Andes at 832 Miramar Terrace, requested that the roofline be lowered to provide a view for them of the bay and Foster City as much as possible which the current design did. The Liebermans at 824 Miramar Terrace had a number of requests: 1) to maintain the privacy of the downstairs bedrooms to which the current design did; 2) requested to maintain views of the lagoon, bridge, and the bay from his living room and the filtered lights that he saw through his trees from his bedrooms; and 3) to maintain compatibility with the neighborhood. It was clear that any two-story design at 819 Miramar Terrace would affect the views at 824 Miramar Terrace. He preserved half the lagoon and bay views from the left living room window and proposed to trim the trees in his back yard which would restore the view of the San Mateo bridge from those living room windows in exchange for removing some of the bridge view. The roofline reduction increased the view of the East Bay hills that would be lost from the living room. The design did not impact the view, lights, and trees from the first floor bedrooms. He said that he reduced the front porch width and the second floor width from the facade to reduce the mass. Mr. Hawley proposed to plant five trees to soften the facade. The Liebermans would still have a panoramic and unobstructed bay view from all of their east facing windows on the second floor addition that he put in four to five years ago. The Andrews at 816 Miramar Terrace requested preservation of the view down the driveway and to reduce the apparent size of the house from the kitchen window. The current design moved the mass of the house back with the porch reduction to where the house currently was on the left side of the house and moved the second floor away from the house and it had made a substantial apparent visual impact to his house. The design did not impact his view in any way. Only one person gave feedback to the design after this neighborhood review process was completed. Mr. Hawley said that Mr. Lieberman requested again a right alignment of the second floor and said that he had some ideas and would provide some sketches which he had not. Mr. Hawley thought he did the best he could for everyone else.

Carter Warren, CJW Architecture, project architect, described a small board of photos to the Commission. He said that removal of 79 sq. ft. of porch on the lower floor would reduce the impact on views. Eliminated a small amount of the second floor to lessen the view impact for Mr. Lieberman. Other changes were that: the second floor was moved two ft. to the right, the height was reduced two ft. for the majority of the house, and the master closet had been reduced. The changes had been made at the direction of the Commission and in direct response to the neighbors' views and their input.

David Hawley stated that he and his wife, Linda, had lived in Belmont for 11 years and would like to live in Belmont for the rest of their lives. The process he had gone through had taken a lot of joy out of what he thought should have been a wonderful opportunity for them. He said this was supposed to be a dream house but he had to justify every single aspect of their design. Mr. Hawley stated that he had to disclose private medical information about his family. He had 25 meetings in the past two months with the architect, planner, and neighbors. Mr. Hawley said that he spent at least \$20,000 during this period and lost months of time building during the dry season. He stated that he could not make everybody happy. Mr. Hawley said that after the May 16th meeting, Warren Lieberman told him that he picked the

wrong house and the wrong neighborhood to build this type of a dream house and perhaps they would be better off selling the property and then at least he would make a profit. He stated that he needed a larger home to raise his family. Mr. Hawley said that he had done everything possible to design a beautiful house that would improve the look of the street for the neighbors and the community. He thought that this design would accomplish the objectives of the FAR exception and the design review.

In response to Chair Parsons, Principal Planner de Melo replied that the aggregate living area including the garage would be 3,795 sq. ft. and the new covered porch would be 403 sq. ft. for a total of 4,198 sq. ft.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing.

Warren Lieberman, 824 Miramar Terrace, stated that over 50% of homeowners on Miramar Terrace objected to the proposal, however, he didn't speak to every homeowner on Miramar Terrace. He said that if over 50% of the street view would be maintained, then he would urge the Commission to vote for it. Mr. Lieberman submitted pictures to the Commission. He said that he and Mr. Andrews checked out the story poles and the length of the shadow at 5:00 p.m. from the story poles was at the highest between 17' and 19'. Mr. Lieberman submitted a letter from David Hawley dated June 10 which said this was the latest plan that he would submit to Planning. He said that in regards to the comment he made to Mr. Hawley, he asked him why would he want to build a house from scratch plus request a variance, because a variance by definition was something out of the ordinary that had to be done, so why would he want to subject his family to that if the main concern was to move into a house.

Robert Ledoux, 840 Miramar Ter., stated that his issue was the public view since an ordinance passed 16-18 months ago which said that public views should be maintained as much as possible.

Art Andrews, 816 Miramar Ter., stated that his concern centered around the construction of the two story house. He didn't oppose them having a two story house, the architecture, or the Hawleys being their neighbors. He opposed the design which would be a very large house, and the view corridor being obstructed. Mr. Andrews said that he watched the fireworks last night through the story poles. He suggested that the proposed addition be built on the south uphill side of the existing house so that the addition would be softened and the view corridor would remain. Mr. Andrews suggested that the Hawleys continue to work with the neighbors to find a solution.

Robert Benner, 2112 Coronet, stated that he lived here for 20 years and raised three children in the community. He said that the Hawleys were the nicest and amongst the fairest who would be before the Commission. Mr. Benner requested that the Commission vote in favor of the proposal.

Brett Andrews, 816 Miramar Terrace, stated that he lived here for 25 years. He said that his bedroom window faced east towards 819 Miramar Terrace and mentioned that he woke up every morning with the sun filtering through the trees to his bedroom. Mr. Andrews was concerned that the house would be built too high and too forward and was also concerned about blockage of views.

Dave Miclean, 93 Ralston Ranch Rd., stated that he was a Belmont resident for 11 years, a former neighbor of the Hawleys, and echoed Dr. Benner's statement that you wouldn't find better people to live with in the neighborhood. He said that the Hawleys had spent an inordinate amount of money and time.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mathewson, seconded by Commissioner Petersen to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

In response to Commissioner Mathewson, Principal Planner de Melo replied that one of the major issues was the preservation of views from hillsides. He said that one of the design review findings was to protect the ridgelines and to minimize the disruption of existing public views.

The Commission's comments included: the protection of the ridgelines was not to protect the view of ridgelines but to protect the ridgelines themselves from being over developed; the views would be a separate issue from ridgelines; that one finding combined two issues which sounded like a topic for the September 19 Commission meeting as possibly separating those two items; the owner addressed many of the adjacent neighbors' concerns; the overall height had been reduced; there was more of a view corridor than was previously proposed; didn't have a problem with the FAR exception since the lots across the street were essentially the same size and these parcels could be rezoned for more square footage if the housing element was updated next year; seemed like 10 of the 13 signatures were from surrounding neighbors on the petition; the ordinance addressed the public views and not the individual views of the neighbors; if views were to be preserved, then some houses shouldn't have been built at all; the home at 819 Miramar Terrace allowed a minuscule view of the bay and Foster City; had to praise the homeowner for doing a great deal of extensive work trying to make this acceptable to the neighborhood; asked architect about Mr. Lieberman's comment about removing the two steps upward; the intent of the design review ordinance just happened here in which the neighbors had an opportunity to express their concerns so the owners knew what the concerns were and could make every effort to try to accommodate them; didn't think it was the intent of the ordinance to take property rights away from property owners but rather to make better neighbors; the concern was public views; and these were the most elaborate story poles she had seen.

Mr. Warren replied that the main floor of the house would remain at the existing elevation. The steps at the elevation were accomplished by some minor grading at the front of the house so that one would feel a sense of arrival.

Mr. Hawley said that it cost \$4K every time he put up story poles not to mention architectural fees.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mathewson, seconded by Commissioner Purcell to approve Resolution No. 2000-35 approving a floor area ratio exception and design review at 819 Miramar Terrace:

AYES: Mathewson, Purcell, Parsons

NOES: Petersen

ABSENT: Peirona

RECUSED: Wiecha

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

At 8:54 p.m., Chair Parsons called for a recess. The meeting reconvened at 9:07 p.m.

Continued Public Hearing - 2605 Somerset Dr.; To consider a conditional use permit to amend a detailed development plan to allow an addition of approximately 1,071 sq. ft. to an existing single-family house (Appl. No. 00-1034); APN: 045-452-060; Zoned: P.D.; CEQA Status: Exempt; John C. Lee (Applicant); Clarence Wong (Owner)

Chair Parsons announced that the applicant had asked for continuance of the public hearing to August 1, 2000.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mathewson, seconded by Commissioner Wiecha to continue the public hearing to August 1, 2000. The motion passed.

Public Hearing - 3236 Upper Lock Av.; To consider a design review and floor area ratio exception to allow the remodeling of existing crawl space into living space and the construction of a deck that would result in a total of 3,871 sq. ft. of floor area where the maximum allowed is 3,500 sq. ft. (Appl. No. 00-1028); APN: 043-203-320; Zoned: R-1B; CEQA Status: Exempt; F. R. Strathdee & Associates (Applicant); William and Dayle Eby, Trustees (Owners)

Principal Planner de Melo presented the staff report recommending approval.

Fred Strathdee, project architect, stated that if the house was built in a normal fashion, then those walls would have originally enclosed the crawl space. The plumbing pipes were visible if one looked at the house from down below. He said that the house would be within the 3,500 sq. ft. if the deck was not included. There would be no grading except for the trenching of the perimeter footing.

Principal Planner de Melo stated that the square footage would be 3,516 if the deck was not included.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

The Commission's comments included: the enclosed crawl space could become a secondary dwelling unit; and could see why the owners wanted to expand the deck with the great views.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Petersen to approve Resolution No. 2000-36 approving a design review and floor area ratio exception at 3236 Upper Lock Avenue:

AYES: Wiecha, Petersen, Purcell, Mathewson, Parsons

ABSENT: Peirona

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

Mr. Strathdee stated that there were no plans to convert the proposed addition to a secondary dwelling unit.

Public Hearing - 1070 Sixth Av.; To consider a conditional use permit and design review to allow a wireless telecommunications facility that consists of six (6) wall mounted antennas and a 10' x 30' (300 sq. ft.) equipment area to be located on the roof of the existing City Hall building (Appl. No. 00-

1018); APN: 045-181-230, -260, and -280; Zoned: C-2/D-1; CEQA Status: Exempt; Sprint Communications (Applicant); City of Belmont (Owner)

Principal Planner presented the staff report recommending approval. Chair Parsons asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Jonas Ionin, Green Drake Engineering, representing Sprint PCS, stated that the revised plans were much more aesthetically pleasing than the previous proposal. Based on the Hammett and Edison report, the ambient RF frequencies at ground level would be .19% and less than 1% within the building and these were at maximum levels. He said that the required wattage for the network would be at 8.

Commissioner Petersen understood that the Commission was prohibited from making any decisions on any health impacts. Deputy City Attorney Rubens stated that the FCC and the federal government had preempted local governments from regulating or making a decision regarding these types of facilities based upon health impacts. Chair Parsons opened the public hearing.

Bruce Ratcliff, 1308 Sunnyslope Av., listed several people's names who opposed the proposed project. He said that if he couldn't talk about health effects, then he would talk about property values. He stated that Senator Hayden had a bill which passed the Senate and was on its way to the House regarding the health aspects. He distributed a photo to the Commission of the Pacific Bell building on Laurel in San Carlos. There were two transmitters in San Carlos and he had spent over \$600K to mitigate them.

F.H. Sandifer, 1319 Paloma Av., appreciated staff's courtesy of sending out additional hearing notices per his request. He said this was a siting issue. Mr. Sandifer stated that he had lived here for 24 years. The City would be spending a million dollars to beautify the building and would be adding antennas to uglify the building. The City of Belmont would be receiving \$1,800/month for 300 sq. ft. on the roof. He stated that he would like to see a photo of the proposed antennas. Sprint reaching Redwood Shores was not a Belmont responsibility. He suggested that the applicant map the location of these antennas. Mr. Sandifer suggested inviting AT&T, MCI, etc. to bid on siting antennas on top of City Hall. He mentioned that other cities had asked for profit sharing.

MOTION: By Commissioner Purcell, seconded by Commissioner Wiecha to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

Mr. Ionin suggested conditioning the project for five years if health issues came up. He stated that he wasn't siting antennas at Belmont City Hall to provide service to Redwood Shores. Mr. Ionin said that he had attended hearings to site antennas at Hotel Sofitel. Mr. Ionin just sited antennas at the South Bayside Water Treatment Facility to provide coverage to Redwood Shores. The antennas would not be pointed east, however, they're pointed north and south to cover El Camino Real and they're pointed west to provide coverage to the residents in Belmont.

Chair Parsons stated for the record that there were no plans to make changes to the facade where these antennas would be located.

Principal Planner de Melo stated that the current lease agreement stipulated a five-year initial term and two five-year renewable terms. Staff preferred the language be written into the lease agreement if new

health information came about. Commissioners Purcell, Petersen, and Parsons stated that they would like to see this language.

The Commission's comments included: viewed the videos from the citizens; thought it was outrageous to not be able to base this on safety issues; suggested that those who oppose this to carry their objections to the federal government; some of the video remarks were clearly based on fears that were not substantiated; and it was also clear that the studies had not been made to see whether those fears were valid or not.

Deputy City Attorney Rubens stated that the Commission was reviewing the use permit and the design review and thought that the Commission could request the Council add such a provision to the lease.

MOTION: By Commissioner Purcell, seconded by Commissioner Wiecha to approve Resolution No. 2000-37 approving a conditional use permit and design review to allow a Sprint PCS wireless communication facility at 1070 Sixth Avenue and requested the City Council to add the language to the lease agreement as discussed above:

AYES: Petersen, Purcell, Mathewson, Wiecha, Parsons

ABSENT: Peirona

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

Public Hearing - 600 Clipper Dr.; To consider design review to construct a 38,765 sq. ft. addition and parking lot/landscaping improvements (Phase II) to the existing 118,735 sq. ft. commercial office building (Phase I). Entitlements granted for Phases I and II on November 16, 1993. Environmental and parking/circulation impacts for Phases I and II mitigated as part of the Island Park Mixed Development FEIR adopted on March 28, 1989 and Oracle Island Park Office Expansion Project FEIR adopted on July 14, 1998 (Appl. No. 00-1041); APN: 040-360-470; Zoned: P.D. (Planned Development); CEQA Status: Adopted Island Park Mixed Development FEIR and adopted Oracle Island Park Office Expansion Project FEIR; DES Architects and Engineers (Applicant); 600 Clipper LLC (Owner)

Principal Planner de Melo presented the staff report recommending approval. Chair Parsons asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Craig Ivankovich, DES Architects, briefly described the building designed seven years ago. He said that there was an existing catch basin in the open space and another would be added in the new parking lot. In response to Commissioner Purcell, he replied that he tried to maintain consistency with the project and the original plan had proposed a similar landscape plan, however, he would be open to any alternative plant materials.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing.

Liz, a Farallon homeowner asked about lighting and the location of the parking lot, and mentioned that the runoff drained towards the houses.

Mr. Ivankovich stated that a lighting study was done, and light fixtures were located away from the property line. The parking lot would have curbs and any water would be taken into the storm system.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mathewson, seconded by Commissioner Wiecha to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

The Commission's comments included: wanted more native trees and shrub, and more parking lot landscaping; needed more bike racks; suggested that staff work with the applicant regarding the landscaping; didn't have a problem with additional parking spaces; insisted something be done with storm drain and runoff to protect the slough; and suggested implementing a higher standard than the County's standards.

Chair Parsons suggested that Commissioner Purcell spend some time with the Department of Public Works regarding best management practices. Commissioner Purcell said that she would do that and also spend some time at the County.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to approve Resolution No. 2000-38 approving design review for a 38,765 square foot building addition to the existing 118,735 square foot commercial office building at 600 Clipper Drive:

AYES: Purcell, Mathewson, Wiecha, Petersen, Parsons

ABSENT: Peirona

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES, AND COMMENTS

Chair Parsons said that he would be away during the month of August. Commissioner Purcell stated that she would be absent more frequently than now due to her election campaign.

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m. to meet in a regular meeting on July 18, 2000.